



# THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## Edinburgh Research Explorer

### **Capuchin monkeys with similar personalities have higher-quality relationships independent of age, sex, kinship, and rank**

#### **Citation for published version:**

Morton, FB, Weiss, A, Buchanan-Smith, HM & Lee, PC 2015, 'Capuchin monkeys with similar personalities have higher-quality relationships independent of age, sex, kinship, and rank' *Animal Behaviour*, vol. 105, pp. 163-171. DOI: 10.1016/j.anbehav.2015.04.013

#### **Digital Object Identifier (DOI):**

[10.1016/j.anbehav.2015.04.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2015.04.013)

#### **Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

#### **Document Version:**

Peer reviewed version

#### **Published In:**

*Animal Behaviour*

#### **Publisher Rights Statement:**

© 2015. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 licence  
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

#### **General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

#### **Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



1 **Capuchin monkeys with similar personalities have higher-quality**  
2 **relationships independent of age, sex, kinship, and rank**

3

4 **F. Blake Morton<sup>1,3</sup>, Alexander Weiss<sup>2,3</sup>, Hannah M. Buchanan-Smith<sup>1,3</sup>,**  
5 **Phyllis C. Lee<sup>1,3</sup>**

6

7 <sup>1</sup> Behaviour and Evolution Research Group, Psychology, School of Natural  
8 Sciences, University of Stirling, UK.

9 <sup>2</sup> School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences, Department of  
10 Psychology, University of Edinburgh, UK.

11 <sup>3</sup> Scottish Primate Research Group, UK.

12

13

14

15 **Word count (excluding references): 5,933**

16

17

18

19 **Correspondence:**

20 Blake Morton, PhD

21 Psychology, School of Natural Sciences

22 University of Stirling, Stirling, UK FK94LA

23 Email: [morton.blake@gmail.com](mailto:morton.blake@gmail.com)

24

## Abstract

Social relationships vary in content, quality, and patterning. Most researchers focus on whether and how non-dispositional factors, including age, sex, kinship, and rank predict variance in the content, quality, and patterning of relationships. However, within a species, these factors do not always predict partner choice. We examined whether similarity in any of five personality traits --- Assertiveness, Openness, Neuroticism, Sociability, and Attentiveness --- independently contributed to variation in the affiliative and agonistic relationships of pairs of brown capuchin monkeys. Capuchins that were more similar in Neuroticism had higher affiliative relationship scores, while capuchins that were more similar in Sociability shared overall higher-quality relationships (i.e. the difference between the dyad's affiliative and agonistic scores). These effects were independent of age, sex, kinship, and rank, suggesting that certain aspects of the psychology of these animals may contribute uniquely to the quality of their social relationships.

**Keywords:** *Cebus apella*, homophily, partner compatibility, sociability, social rank, temperament

## 25 **Introduction**

26       Social relationships vary in content (e.g. sexual, parenting, affiliation or conflict),  
 27       quality (e.g. the intensity of affiliation or aggression), and patterning (e.g. frequency and  
 28       temporal stability) (Hinde, 1976). Studying how and why social relationships vary among  
 29       interactants has implications for understanding theoretical and applied questions, such  
 30       as gene flow (Morin et al., 1994; Pilot, Dahlheim, & Hoelzel, 2010), disease and  
 31       information transfer (Allen, Weinrich, Hoppitt, & Rendell, 2013; Kuehl, Elzner, Moebius,  
 32       Boesch, & Walsh, 2008; Zelner et al., 2012), health and well-being (Archie, Altmann, &  
 33       Alberts, 2012; Kikusui, Winslow, & Mori, 2006), sexual selection (e.g. mate choice;  
 34       DeVries, DeVries, Taymans, & Carter, 1995; Schülke, Bhagavatula, Vigilant, & Ostner,  
 35       2010), life history (Holt-Lunstad, Smith, & Layton, 2010; Seyfarth, Silk, & Cheney, 2012;  
 36       Silk et al., 2010), and social decision-making (e.g. cooperation versus conflict; Clutton-  
 37       Brock & Huchard, 2013; Clutton-Brock, 2009).

38       Differences in non-dispositional factors, including partners' age, sex, rank, and  
 39       kinship are commonly used to explain why relationships vary (e.g. Clutton-Brock &  
 40       Huchard, 2013; MacCormick et al., 2012; Widdig, Nürnberg, Krawczak, Streich, &  
 41       Bercovitch, 2001). This may be because such non-dispositional factors reflect  
 42       differences in partners' quality (e.g., health, fighting ability; Clutton-Brock & Huchard,  
 43       2013; Sapolsky, 2004), socioecological needs (e.g., food, sex, protection, and/or  
 44       parental investment; Clutton-Brock & Huchard, 2013; Isbell & Young, 2015; Trivers,  
 45       1972), physiology (e.g., stress and reproductive hormones; Sapolsky, 2004;  
 46       Zimmerberg & Farley, 1993), and developmental trajectories (Hollén & Radford, 2009;  
 47       Loretto, Fraser, & Bugnyar, 2012). Identifying non-dispositional factors that contribute to

social relationship variance has helped researchers understand why animals are selective in their choice of social partners. For instance, females usually seek higher-quality relationships (i.e. those that are more affiliative than agonistic) with males, particularly alpha group members, as this affords them better protection and access to high-quality food (Clutton-Brock & Huchard, 2013).

However, the explanatory power of non-dispositional factors is not consistent across studies of social relationships. For example, in bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*), age and sex predict spatial affiliation in some populations (Lusseau & Newman, 2004), but not in others (Félix, 1997; Lusseau et al., 2006). In barnacle geese (*Branta leucopsis*), Kurvers et al. (2013) found that social rank was unrelated to social affiliation, whereas kinship had a significant effect. In brown (or “tufted”) capuchin monkeys (*Sapajus apella*, formerly *Cebus apella*; Alfaro, Silva, & Rylands, 2012), Tiddi, Aureli, Polizzi Di Sorrentino, Janson, & Schino (2011) reported that social tolerance was unrelated to kinship and rank, but weakly related to sex. Other factors may therefore contribute to social relationship variance beyond non-disposition factors.

### *Personality and social relationships*

Personality is an umbrella term used to describe individual differences in behaviour, affect, and cognition that are consistent across time and contexts (Dingemanse & Réale, 2005; Gosling, 2008; Koski, 2014; Weiss & Adams, 2010). Measures of personality are associated with individual differences in social decision-making (Aplin, Farine, Mann, & Sheldon, 2014; Krause, James, & Croft, 2010), performance on cognitive and learning tasks (Carere & Locurto, 2011; Morton, Lee, &

Buchanan-Smith, 2013; Sih & Del Giudice, 2012), risk-taking (Dammhahn & Almeling, 2012), subjective well-being (Gartner & Weiss, 2013; King & Landau, 2003; Weiss et al., 2009; Weiss, King, & Perkins, 2006) and coping strategies (Coppens, de Boer, & Koolhaas, 2010; Martins et al., 2011). Personality traits are also heritable and reflect life history measures, including longevity and reproductive output (Biro & Stamps, 2008; Silk et al., 2010; van Oers, Drent, de Goede, & van Noordwijk, 2004; Weiss, Gartner, Gold, & Stoinski, 2013; Wolf, van Doorn, Leimar, & Weissing, 2007).

Despite the popular notion that “opposites attract”, individuals with similar personalities form stronger, more affiliative social bonds compared to other dyads. Such findings have been reported across a range of phylogenetically distant taxa, suggesting that similarities in personality may be a fundamental component of animal sociality. For example, pair bonding in eastern bluebirds (*Sialia sialis*) occurs more often between mates that are similar in aggressiveness (Harris & Siefferman, 2014). In rhesus macaques (*Macaca mulatta*), individuals are more affiliative with group members that are similar in Equability (e.g., *calm/slow*) and Adaptability (e.g., *flexible/gentle*) (Weinstein & Capitanio, 2008).

Personality similarities may signal partner quality (e.g. fighting ability or genetic compatibility). In great tits (*Parus major*) and in zebra finches (*Taeniopygia guttata*), similarity in exploration and aggression are positive indicators of future offspring quality (e.g. body mass; Both, Dingemanse, Drent, & Tinbergen, 2005; Schuett, Dall, & Royle, 2011). In guppies (*Poecilia reticulata*), sexual partners that are similar in boldness have higher parturition success than more dissimilar partners (Ariyomo & Watt, 2013).

Personality similarity may also reflect emotional or behavioural compatibility and predictability between potential social partners. In humans, perceived personality similarity promotes friendship intensity (Selfhout, Denissen, Branje, & Meeus, 2009) while couples in which both members have lower neuroticism (a measure of negative affect) report greater relationship satisfaction (e.g. Caughlin, Huston, & Houts, 2000; Heller, Watson, & Hies, 2004; Karney & Bradbury, 1997).

To date, most of what is known about associations between personality similarity and social relationship variance comes from studies of affiliative behaviour (e.g., Massen & Koski, 2014; Schuett et al., 2011; Seyfarth, Silk, & Cheney, 2014; Weinstein & Capitanio, 2008). Few data are available on the role that personality similarities play in agonistic relationships and overall social relationship quality (i.e. the intensity of affiliative versus agonistic behaviour between partners). Also, in many studies, non-dispositional factors are usually not, or only partially, controlled for (e.g., Humbad, Donnellan, Iacono, McGue, & Burt, 2010; Massen & Koski, 2014; Schuett et al., 2011; Seyfarth et al., 2014; Weinstein & Capitanio, 2008; but see Seyfarth et al., 2014). Controlling for non-dispositional factors is critical for several reasons. For instance, partner similarities in bold or aggressive personality traits may reflect attraction towards individuals that are similar in rank (e.g., Dahlbom, Lagman, Lundstedt-Enkel, Sundström, & Winberg, 2011). In addition, as these (and other) personality traits are heritable (Dochtermann, Schwab, Sih, & Dochtermann, 2015; Drent, van Oers, & van Noordwijk, 2003; Sinn, Apiolaza, & Moltschaniwskyj, 2006), partner similarities in personality may be proxies for the degree of relatedness between pair members. Controlling for non-dispositional factors therefore allows researchers to determine if

psychological factors other than those reflected by non-dispositional factors contribute to variation in social relationships.

### *The present study*

Studies of wild and captive brown capuchin monkeys often report mixed results with regards to the role of non-dispositional factors in the social relationships of these animals. While Schino, Di Giuseppe, & Visalberghi (2009) and Tiddi, Aureli, & Schino (2012) found that brown capuchins preferentially give coalitionary support to kin, Ferreira, Izar, & Lee (2006) found no such preference within a different study population. Some studies report that brown capuchins groom “down” the hierarchy (Parr, Matheson, Bernstein, & De waal, 1997), while others report no significant association between grooming and rank (Schino et al., 2009), or report that their population grooms “up” the hierarchy (Tiddi et al., 2012). Therefore, personality may be an additional factor contributing to capuchin social relationships.

Brown capuchins, and the closely related white-faced capuchin (*Cebus capucinus*), exhibit pronounced individual differences in personality (Manson & Perry, 2013; Morton, Lee, Buchanan-Smith, et al., 2013; Uher, Addessi, & Visalberghi, 2013). These differences are stable over time (Manson & Perry, 2013; Uher et al., 2013) and ratings of these traits are consistent across observers (Manson & Perry, 2013; Morton, Lee, Buchanan-Smith, et al., 2013). Moreover, capuchin personality traits are associated with physiological measures (e.g. cortisol reactivity; Byrne & Suomi, 2002) and behavioural observations (Manson & Perry, 2013; Morton, Lee, & Buchanan-Smith, 2013; Morton, Lee, Buchanan-Smith, et al., 2013; Uher et al., 2013).



In the present study, we investigated associations between personality similarities and the affiliative and agonistic components of brown capuchin social relationships. We predicted that, controlling for age, sex, kinship, and rank, subjects with similar personalities would share higher-quality social relationships, defined here as relationships that were more affiliative than agonistic.

## **Methods and Materials**

### *Study site and subjects*

Eighteen brown capuchin monkeys (*Sapajus sp.*) were studied at the Living Links to Human Evolution Research Centre (LL), located within the Royal Zoological Society of Scotland (RZSS), Edinburgh Zoo, UK (Macdonald & Whiten, 2011). Subjects were from two breeding groups. At the time of study, the “East” group contained 4 adult males, 3 adult females, 1 juvenile male, and 5 infants (following age-sex categories in (Fragaszy, Visalberghi, & Fedigan, 2004). The “West” group contained 4 adult males, 3 adult females, 2 juvenile males, 1 juvenile female, and 5 infants. Infants dependent on their mothers (i.e., those less than a year old) were not included as study subjects. Subjects’ ages ranged from 2 to 40 years for males (mean  $\pm$  SD = 10.79  $\pm$  8.55 years,  $N$  = 11), and 3 to 14 years for females (mean  $\pm$  SD = 8.86  $\pm$  3.63 years,  $N$  = 7). All group members were captive born except an adult male from East group, who was hand-reared, and the original wild-caught alpha male of West group; both individuals came to LL as established members of their groups.

Both breeding groups were housed separately in identically designed 189 m<sup>3</sup> indoor enclosures with natural light and near-permanent access to a 900 m<sup>2</sup> outdoor

enclosure containing trees and other vegetation, providing ample opportunity to engage in natural behaviours. All monkeys received commercial TrioMunch pellets supplemented with fresh fruits and vegetables three times daily and were given cooked chicken and hardboiled eggs once a week. Water was available *ad libitum* at all times. Further details of housing and husbandry are provided in (Leonardi, Buchanan-Smith, Dufour, MacDonald, & Whiten, 2010).

### *Ethical note*

This study was entirely observational except for one aspect of data collection involving puzzle feeders, which were placed within the monkeys' outdoor enclosures (see "Behavioural sampling"). Subjects could interact freely with the puzzle feeders, which were made entirely of non-hazardous material. The feeders provided a source of food snacks (raisins) and enrichment to subjects. This study was approved by Edinburgh Zoo, the ethics committee of the Psychology Department at the University of Stirling, and complied with regulations of the Association for the Study of Animal Behaviour (2012).

### *Personality*

Details on data collection and analyses of our subjects' personalities are provided in Morton, Lee, Buchanan-Smith, et al. (2013). Briefly, subjects in the present study were part of a study of 127 brown capuchin monkeys housed at 7 sites who were rated by 3.24  $\pm$  1.61 knowledgeable informants on the 54 traits contained in the Hominoid Personality Questionnaire (Weiss et al., 2009). Capuchins at Living Links were rated in

August 2010. Principal components of mean ratings across all sites and observers for the 54 reliable traits revealed five personality dimensions. These dimensions were: Assertiveness, Openness, Attentiveness, Neuroticism, and Sociability (Table 1). These personality dimensions showed good inter-rater reliabilities and were associated with relevant behaviours recorded up to a year later (Table 1; Morton, Lee, & Buchanan-Smith, 2013; Morton, Lee, Buchanan-Smith, et al., 2013), thereby demonstrating the validity and temporal stability of subjects' personality scores. Data used to assess social relationship quality come from the same time period as the behaviours used to validate our personality scores (see "Behavioural sampling").

In the present study, personality similarities between partners were calculated for each personality dimension by subtracting one partner's personality z-score on that dimension from the other partner's z-score on that dimension, and taking the absolute value. To make the results more interpretable, this value was then transformed into a z-score.

### *Behavioural sampling*

Fifty-four hours of focal observations were recorded between May and August of 2011, totalling 3 hours per individual. Data were collected one year after subjects' personalities were assessed. Behaviours (Table 2) were recorded daily per focal monkey for 10 minutes. Monkeys were sampled evenly between 9:00 and 17:30. Incidences of aggression, coalitions, scrounging, and food sharing were recorded continuously; all other behaviours were recorded at 1-min intervals using point sampling (Martin & Bateson, 2007). In each point sample, group members within two body

lengths from the focal were recorded. The total number of sampling points was the same for all subjects.

Between 15 May 2011 and 8 June 2011 five puzzle feeders were introduced to the outdoor enclosures of the East and West groups. All group members could freely interact with the feeders. Each feeder was made out of a cylindrical piece of white piping (length: 76.2cm, diameter: 5.08cm), with approximately 8-10 holes drilled into it (Fig. A1). Each hole was 2.5 cm in diameter. Feeders were attached vertically to trees and spaced 2-10 meters from each other. For each feeder, the bottom of the pipe was left open while the top of the pipe was closed. Ten paper packets, each containing five raisins, were placed in the top portion of each feeder, and wooden sticks were inserted into the holes of the pipes to prevent the packets from falling out from the bottom. This prevented subjects from accessing the paper packets in the top portion of the pipe, but allowed the packets to drop freely from the pipe once all the wooden sticks had been removed.

Feeders were introduced four days a week for approximately 30 minutes each day or until all of the puzzle feeders had been solved. During sessions, all instances were recorded in which a monkey approached another monkey at a feeding site, noting whether the receiving monkey responded to their approach by avoiding or staying at the feeder within the first 10 seconds of being approached. East group underwent 8 sessions, and West group underwent 10 sessions. These data were used to calculate avoid-stay symmetries in calculations of relationship quality.

*Data reduction and computing social relationship quality*

Measures of relationship quality were calculated per subject interacting with all other available partners, resulting in a total of 73 dyads. Following previous studies of social relationship quality (e.g. Fraser, Schino, & Aureli, 2008; Koski, de Vries, van de Kraats, & Sterck, 2012; Majolo, Ventura, & Schino, 2010; McFarland & Majolo, 2011; Rebecchini, Schaffner, & Aureli, 2011), 10 behavioural measures (Table 3) were calculated as events per monkey dyad and subjected to a principal components analysis (PCA) with varimax and promax rotation. A scree plot and parallel analysis were used to determine the number of components to extract from the PCA (Horn 1965; Zwick & Velicer, 1986). Components were considered robust if they contained absolute loadings that were greater than or equal to |0.7| and/or were greater than |0.4| on 4 or more items (Guadagnoli & Velicer, 1988). For each component, we computed unit-weighted scores (Gorsuch, 1983) and converted these into z-scores.

Overall mean number of social dyadic interactions are provided in Table A2; the values are low because they reflect behaviour per dyad, not per individual and therefore contain zeros for non-interacting dyads. These values are within the range of values reported by other studies using similar methods (e.g. Majolo et al., 2010; McFarland & Majolo, 2011; Rebecchini et al., 2011). We used means instead of medians because there would otherwise be zero for some contexts.

#### *Non-dispositional factors*

Age (in years) was determined for the time period when data on subjects' social relationships was collected. Win/loss outcomes from agonistic interactions were used to calculate David's scores, a continuous measure of rank, for each subject (Gammell &

Vries, 2003). Then, for each of these non-dispositional factors, similarity was calculated for each dyad by subtracting one partner's value from the other partner's value, and taking the absolute value. These values were then transformed into z-scores.

In addition to age and rank similarity, we recorded for each dyad whether they were a same or opposite sex. We also recorded their genetic relatedness based on pedigrees and expressed this using Wright's coefficient of relatedness:  $r = 0.5$  for parent-offspring and full sibling pairs relations,  $r = 0.375$  for  $\frac{3}{4}$  siblings (e.g. cases of inbreeding),  $r = 0.25$  for grandparent-grandchild relations,  $r = 0.25$  for aunt/uncle-nephew/niece relations,  $r = 0.125$  for half siblings, and  $r = 0.125$  for first cousins. Thus, in all cases except for relatedness, lower values indicate higher degrees of similarity between the members of a dyad.

### *Statistical analyses*

We assessed the affiliative and agonistic components of capuchins' social relationships by entering the behavioural calculations listed in Table 3 into a PCA using SPSS 19 (IBM Corp., Chicago, IL, USA). For this analysis we determined the number of components to extract using both the scree plot and a parallel analysis (Field, 2009; Horn 1965).

For our tests of associations between partner similarities in non-dispositional factors and personality and relationship quality, we used robust analyses to reduce the impact of potential outliers. Furthermore, because each subject would be represented in multiple dyads, and observations were therefore not independent, we used

bootstrapping to generate 95% confidence intervals in these analyses. All of the association tests were conducted using R version 3.1.2 (R Core Team, 2014).

We used Spearman rank-order correlations to examine bivariate associations between relationship scores and similarity in age, kinship, rank, and the five personality dimensions. For these analyses we used the boot function (Canty & Ripley, 2012) to generate confidence intervals using the bias-corrected and accelerated bootstrap (Davison & Hinkley, 1997; Efron, 1987).

To test whether similarity in sex was associated with each of the three relationship scores we used the FRBhotellingMM function (Van Aelst & Willems, 2009) to conduct robust Hotelling tests using the MM-estimator. To test whether the effects of personality similarity contributed to each of the three relationship scores over and above the contribution of non-dispositional factors, we used the FRBmultiregMM function (Van Aelst & Willems, 2009) to conduct three robust multiple regressions using the MM-estimator. The 95% confidence intervals for these analyses were generated using the bias-corrected and accelerated bootstrap (Davison & Hinkley, 1997; Efron, 1987).

## **Results**

### *Principal Components Analyses*

Both the scree plot (Fig. A2) and parallel analysis (Table A1) suggested that two components should be retained. These two components explained 55.0% of the variance and were weakly correlated ( $r = -0.072$ ). A comparison between the varimax- and promax-rotated solutions revealed little difference in structure (Table 4 and Table A3). Thus, interpretation of the components was based on the varimax-rotated solution.

Component 1 was characterized by moderate to high loadings on behaviours related to social affiliation (e.g. proximity, grooming), and was therefore labelled “Affiliative”. Component 2 was characterized by high loadings on conflict and conflict symmetry and was therefore labelled “Agonistic”.

Monkey dyads with higher scores on Component 1 and 2 thus engaged in more affiliative and agonistic behaviours, respectively. Therefore, for remaining analyses, relationship quality was defined as the difference between the affiliative score and agonistic score for each dyad, whereby “higher-quality” relationships were those that were more affiliative than agonistic.

#### *Social relationships and similarities in personality and non-dispositional factors*

Dyads similar in Sociability had significantly higher affiliative scores (Table 5). Dyads similar in age, rank, and Openness had significantly lower agonistic scores. In terms of relationship quality, dyads similar in rank, Openness, and Sociability had higher-quality relationships than did other dyads. Kinship, sex, and the other three personality traits were not significantly related to affiliative scores, agonistic scores, or overall relationship quality.

The results of the robust Hotelling tests revealed that same-sex dyads did not differ significantly from opposite-sex dyads in their affiliative scores (4979 bootstrap samples,  $T^2_R = 1.65$ ,  $P = 0.26$ ), in their agonistic scores (4549 bootstrap samples,  $T^2_R = 3.29$ ,  $P = 0.19$ ), or in their overall relationship quality (4959 bootstrap samples,  $T^2_R = 0.49$ ,  $P = 0.55$ ).



The results of the multiple regression analysis are presented in Table 6. The sole predictor of affiliative scores was Neuroticism; monkeys that were more similar in Neuroticism were more affiliative. None of the personality traits or non-dispositional factors were independently related to agonistic scores. The sole predictor of overall relationship quality was Sociability; higher relationship quality was associated with dyads who were more similar in Sociability.

## **Discussion**

When non-disposition factors were not controlled for, similarities in Openness and Sociability were positively related to subjects' affiliative scores and overall relationship quality. When controlling for non-dispositional factors, the unique effects of similarities in Neuroticism and Sociability were independently related to higher affiliative scores and overall relationship quality, respectively. Our findings therefore support the hypothesis that capuchin dyads with similar personalities, regardless of whether both partners scored high, low, or somewhere in between on those traits, share higher-quality social relationships, and that for some traits those effects are independent of non-dispositional factors.

At the individual level, previous studies have shown that Openness is negatively associated with the amount of time that brown capuchins behave aggressively towards others (Morton, Lee, Buchanan-Smith, et al., 2013), and that less aggressive capuchins typically avoid more aggressive individuals (Janson, 1990). Thus capuchins more similar in Openness may share higher-quality relationships because they are more socially compatible. Since capuchins that scored high on Openness were also more

playful and curious (Morton, Lee, Buchanan-Smith, et al., 2013), these capuchins may also have been attracted to one another due to their general playfulness and interest in each others' activities. Individual differences in Openness are inversely related to differences in age and social rank (Morton 2014), which may explain why this personality trait did not contribute to dyadic differences in relationship quality independent of non-dispositional factors.

Previous work has shown that individual differences in capuchin Sociability are positively related to the amount of time subjects spend in close proximity to others in general (Morton, Lee, Buchanan-Smith, et al., 2013). Across a range of taxa, individuals that score highly on neurotic traits (e.g. shyness, reactivity) show greater levels of stress and emotional instability (Gunthert, Cohen, & Armeli, 1999; Millot et al., 2014; Raoult, Brown, Zuberi, & Williamson, 2012). Among our study subjects, individuals that score highly on Neuroticism typically show greater signs of agitation (e.g. greater movement within their main enclosures, and poorer attention span during cognitive testing; Morton, Lee, & Buchanan-Smith, 2013; Morton, Lee, Buchanan-Smith, et al., 2013; Morton 2014). Thus, individuals that are similar in Sociability and Neuroticism may establish higher-quality social relationships with one another because they are more emotionally and/or socially compatible.

The association between social relationship quality and similarity in Openness, Sociability, and Neuroticism is not unique to capuchins. In chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*), similarities in Sociability are positively related to the amount of time partners spend in close proximity to each other (Massen & Koski, 2014). In humans, similarities in Openness, Extraversion, and Neuroticism, which are analogous to

capuchin Openness, Sociability, and Neuroticism, respectively (Morton, Lee, Buchanan-Smith, et al., 2013), are associated with lower levels of aggression and higher rates of affiliation in relationships (Barlett & Anderson, 2012; Dijkstra & Barelds, 2007; Jones, Miller, & Lynam, 2011). Such striking overlap between phylogenetically distant species (Steiper & Young, 2006) suggests that the importance of these personality traits to relationship quality has a long evolutionary history.

In addition to personality, individuals that were similar in age and rank were less aggressive towards one another, and monkeys that were similar in rank shared higher-quality relationships. The effect of age similarity on agonistic scores may be related to the fact that capuchin rank is associated with age in this sample (Lefevre et al., 2014; Morton 2014). These findings are also consistent with previous work in other capuchin populations: higher-ranking individuals (particularly the alpha male) tend to direct aggression towards younger, lower-ranking individuals, which in turn may impact the overall quality of their social relationships (Fragaszy et al., 2004; Janson, 1990).

### *Future Directions*

One remaining question concerns the mechanism(s) that bring about associations between personality similarities and relationship quality in capuchin dyads. One possibility is that capuchins seek social partners with similar personalities. A second possibility is that partners' personalities converge over time as a result of conditioning or sharing social experiences. To determine whether our findings are the result of "attraction" and/or "convergence" will require a longitudinal study in which personality and social relationship quality are measured at multiple time points.

Further research is also needed to determine why similarities in Sociability and Neuroticism were related to social relationship quality *independent* of non-dispositional factors. Considering the kinds of behaviours associated with these personality traits (e.g. a propensity for social affiliation and agitation, respectively; Morton, Lee, Buchanan-Smith, et al., 2013), one intriguing possibility is that individual differences in Sociability and Neuroticism reflect differences in the emotional and/or socio-cognitive traits that capuchin use to make social decisions that are not simply reflected by non-dispositional factors.

Irrespective of whether non-dispositional factors were controlled for, similarity in Assertiveness and Attentiveness were not associated with differences in partners' affiliative scores, agonistic scores, or overall relationship quality despite previous work showing that both traits correlate with individual differences in subjects' affiliative and agonistic behaviour (Morton, Lee, Buchanan-Smith, et al., 2013). It is unlikely that these results are due to changes in the stability of subjects' scores on Assertiveness and Attentiveness. Previous studies of capuchins have found good evidence for rank-order stability of personality measures (Manson & Perry, 2013; Uher et al., 2013), and, as previously noted, our subjects' scores on Assertiveness and Attentiveness predicted relevant behaviours up to a year later, including behaviours used to assess relationship quality in the current study. Similarities in specific personality traits (i.e. Sociability, Openness, Neuroticism), rather than personality similarities in general, may therefore play a greater role in defining the quality of capuchin social relationships. Alternatively, the relatively small number of dyads may have resulted in statistical power being too low to detect effects from particular personality traits. Although we guarded against

Type I errors by means of robust analyses and bootstrapping procedures, further work with larger samples is needed to determine whether these findings generalize to other capuchin populations.

Kinship and sex were not related to relationship quality. Previous work has reported mixed results with regards to the role that kinship and sex play within capuchin societies (Ferreira et al., 2006; Tiddi et al., 2011, 2012; Welker, Höhmann, & Schäfer-Witt, 1990). It may be that these non-dispositional factors impact relationship quality only under certain socioecological conditions, such as differences in group composition or the number of matrilineal lines within groups (Perry, Manson, Muniz, Gros-Louis, & Vigilant, 2008). Alternatively, as noted before, the small number of dyads within our study may have precluded our ability to detect significant effects from these variables. Finally, given our concerns about statistical power, we did not examine interaction effects in our analyses. Therefore a fruitful avenue for future research would be to determine whether, for example, kin and non-kin dyads differ with regards to what personality traits contribute to their relationship quality.

Seyfarth et al. (2014) studied wild baboons (*Papio ursinus*) and reported that similarities in personality were positively associated with partners' affiliative relationship quality. As in our study, these effects were independent of age, sex, kinship, and rank. To our knowledge, similar analyses (i.e. those that adequately control for all possible effects from non-dispositional factors) are notably lacking in other studies. Also, as previously noted, few studies on any species have tested for independent effects of personality on *both* the affiliative and agonistic components of social relationship quality for their subjects. Further data on a range of primate and non-primate taxa are therefore

needed in order to fill these literary gaps. An integrated comparative approach will allow researchers to better understand the adaptive function and evolutionary history of personality-relationship associations.

## Conclusions

Similarities in personality (Openness, Sociability, Neuroticism) were significantly related to the affiliative and agonistic components of capuchins' social relationships. More importantly, some of these effects (Sociability/Neuroticism) were independent of non-dispositional factors. Such findings suggest that certain aspects of personality (e.g. emotional and/or social compatibility) may contribute to the quality of capuchins' social relationships beyond what is reflected by age, sex, kinship, and rank.

## References

- Alfaro, J. W. L., Silva, J. D. S. E., & Rylands, A. B. (2012). How different are robust and gracile capuchin monkeys? An argument for the use of *Sapajus* and *Cebus*. *American Journal of Primatology*, 74, 273–286.
- Allen, J., Weinrich, M., Hoppitt, W., & Rendell, L. (2013). Network-based diffusion analysis reveals cultural transmission of lobtail feeding in humpback whales. *Science*, 340, 485–488.
- Aplin, L. M., Farine, D. R., Mann, R. P., & Sheldon, B. C. (2014). Individual-level personality influences social foraging and collective behaviour in wild birds. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 281, 20141016.

- 459 Archie, E. a., Altmann, J., & Alberts, S. C. (2012). Social status predicts wound healing  
 460 in wild baboons. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109, 9017–  
 461 9022.
- 462 Ariyomo, T. O., & Watt, P. J. (2013). Disassortative mating for boldness decreases  
 463 reproductive success in the guppy. *Behavioral Ecology*, 24, 1320–1326.
- 464 ASAB (2012). Guidelines for the treatment of animals in behavioural research and  
 465 teaching. *Animal Behaviour*, 83, 301–309.
- 466 Barlett, C. P., & Anderson, C. a. (2012). Direct and indirect relations between the Big 5  
 467 personality traits and aggressive and violent behavior. *Personality and Individual*  
 468 *Differences*, 52, 870–875.
- 469 Biro, P. a., & Stamps, J. a. (2008). Are animal personality traits linked to life-history  
 470 productivity? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 23, 361–368.
- 471 Both, C., Dingemanse, N. J., Drent, P. J., & Tinbergen, J. M. (2005). Pairs of extreme  
 472 avian personalities have highest reproductive success. *Journal of Animal Ecology*,  
 473 74, 667–674.
- 474 Byrne, G., & Suomi, S. J. (2002). Cortisol reactivity and its relation to homecage  
 475 behavior and personality ratings in tufted capuchin (*Cebus apella*) juveniles from  
 476 birth to six years of age. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 27, 139–154.
- 477 Canty, A., & Ripley, B. (2012). *boot: Bootstrap R (S-Plus) functions. R package version.*

- 478 Carere, C., & Locurto, C. (2011). Interaction between animal personality and animal  
479 cognition. *Current Zoology*, 57, 491–498.
- 480 Caughlin, J. P., Huston, T. L., & Houts, R. M. (2000). How does personality matter in  
481 marriage? An examination of trait anxiety, interpersonal negativity, and marital  
482 satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 326–336.
- 483 Clutton-Brock, T. (2009). Cooperation between non-kin in animal societies. *Nature*, 462,  
484 51–57.
- 485 Clutton-Brock, T., & Huchard, E. (2013). Social competition and its consequences in  
486 female mammals. *Journal of Zoology*, 289, 151–171.
- 487 Coppens, C. M., de Boer, S. F., & Koolhaas, J. M. (2010). Coping styles and  
488 behavioural flexibility: towards underlying mechanisms. *Philosophical Transactions*  
489 *of the Royal Society B*, 365, 4021–4028.
- 490 Dahlbom, S. J., Lagman, D., Lundstedt-Enkel, K., Sundström, L. F., & Winberg, S.  
491 (2011). Boldness predicts social status in zebrafish (*Danio rerio*). *PLoS ONE*, 6, 2–  
492 8.
- 493 Dammhahn, M., & Almeling, L. (2012). Is risk taking during foraging a personality trait?  
494 A field test for cross-context consistency in boldness. *Animal Behaviour*, 84, 131–  
495 1139.
- 496 Davison, a C., & Hinkley, D. V. (1997). Bootstrap Methods and Their Application.  
497 *Engineering*, 42, 216.



- 498 DeVries, a C., DeVries, M. B., Taymans, S., & Carter, C. S. (1995). Modulation of pair  
 499 bonding in female prairie voles (*Microtus ochrogaster*) by corticosterone.  
 500 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 92, 7744–7748.
- 501 Dijkstra, P., & Barelds, D. P. H. (2007). Do people know what they want: A similar or  
 502 complementary partner? *Evolutionary Psychology*, 6, 595–602.
- 503 Dingemanse, N., & Réale, D. (2005). Natural selection and animal personality.  
 504 *Behaviour*, 142, 1159–1184.
- 505 Dochtermann, N. A., Schwab, T., Sih, A., & Dochtermann, N. A. (2015). The  
 506 contribution of additive genetic variation to personality variation : heritability of  
 507 personality. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 282, 20142201.
- 508 Drent, P. J., van Oers, K., & van Noordwijk, A. J. (2003). Realized heritability of  
 509 personalities in the great tit (*Parus major*). *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*,  
 510 270, 45–51.
- 511 Efron, B. (1987). Better bootstrap confidence intervals. *Journal of the American*  
 512 *Statistical Association*, 82, 171–185.
- 513 Félix, F. (1997). Organization and social structure of the coastal bottlenose dolphin  
 514 *Tursiops truncatus* in the Gulf de Guayaquil , Ecuador. *Aquatic Mammals*, 23, 1–  
 515 16.

- 516 Ferreira, R. G., Izar, P., & Lee, P. C. (2006). Exchange, affiliation, and protective  
517 interventions in semifree-ranging brown capuchin monkeys (*Cebus apella*).  
518 *American Journal of Primatology*, 68, 765–776.
- 519 Field, A. (2009). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS. Statistics* (Vol. 58).
- 520 Fragaszy, D. M., Visalberghi, E., & Fedigan, L. M. (2004). *The Complete Capuchin: The*  
521 *Biology of the Genus Cebus*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- 522 Fraser, O. N., Schino, G., & Aureli, F. (2008). Components of relationship quality in  
523 chimpanzees. *Ethology*, 114, 834–843.
- 524 Gammell, M., & Vries, H. De. (2003). David's score: a more appropriate dominance  
525 ranking method than Clutton-Brock et al.'s index. *Animal Behaviour*, 66, 601–605.
- 526 Gartner, M. C., & Weiss, A. (2013). Scottish wildcat (*Felis silvestris grampia*) personality  
527 and subjective well-being: Implications for captive management. *Applied Animal*  
528 *Behaviour Science*, 147, 261–267.
- 529 Gorsuch, R. L. (1983). Factor Analysis. *Work Study*, 42, 10–11.
- 530 Gosling, S. D. (2008). Personality in non-human animals. *Social and Personality*  
531 *Psychology Compass*, 2, 985–1001.
- 532 Guadagnoli, E., & Velicer, W. F. (1988). Relation of sample size to the stability of  
533 component patterns. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103, 265–275.

- 534 Gunthert, K. C., Cohen, L. H., & Armeli, S. (1999). The role of neuroticism in daily stress  
535 and coping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 1087–1100.
- 536 Harris, M. R., & Siefferman, L. (2014). Interspecific competition influences fitness  
537 benefits of assortative mating for territorial aggression in eastern bluebirds (*Sialia*  
538 *sialis*). *PLoS ONE*, 9, 1–6.
- 539 Heller, D., Watson, D., & Hies, R. (2004). The role of person versus situation in life  
540 satisfaction: a critical examination. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130, 574–600.
- 541 Hinde, R. A. (1976). Interactions, Relationships and Social Structure. *Man*, 11, 1–17.
- 542 Hollén, L. I., & Radford, A. N. (2009). The development of alarm call behaviour in  
543 mammals and birds. *Animal Behaviour*, 78, 791–800.
- 544 Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., & Layton, J. B. (2010). Social relationships and mortality  
545 risk: A meta-analytic review. *PLoS Medicine*, 7, e1000316.
- 546 Humbad, M. N., Donnellan, M. B., Iacono, W. G., McGue, M., & Burt, S. A. (2010). Is  
547 spousal similarity for personality a matter of convergence or selection? *Personality*  
548 *and Individual Differences*, 49, 827–830.
- 549 Isbell, L. A., & Young, T. P. (2015). Ecological models of female social relationships in  
550 primates : similarities, disparities, and some directions for future clarity. *Behaviour*,  
551 139, 177–202.

- 552 Janson, C. H. (1990). Social correlates of individual spatial choice in foraging groups of  
553 brown capuchin monkeys, *Cebus apella*. *Animal Behaviour*, 40, 910–921.
- 554 Jones, S. E., Miller, J. D., & Lynam, D. R. (2011). Personality, antisocial behavior, and  
555 aggression: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39, 329–337.
- 556 Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (1997). Neuroticism, marital interaction, and the  
557 trajectory of marital satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72,  
558 1075–1092.
- 559 Kikusui, T., Winslow, J. T., & Mori, Y. (2006). Social buffering: relief from stress and  
560 anxiety. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 361, 2215–2228.
- 561 King, J. E., & Landau, V. I. (2003). Can chimpanzee (*Pan troglodytes*) happiness be  
562 estimated by human raters? *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37, 1–15.
- 563 Koski, S. E. (2014). Broader horizons for animal personality research. *Frontiers in*  
564 *Ecology and Evolution*, 2, 1–6.
- 565 Koski, S. E., de Vries, H., van de Kraats, A., & Sterck, E. H. M. (2012). Stability and  
566 change of social relationship quality in captive chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*).  
567 *International Journal of Primatology*, 33, 905–921.
- 568 Krause, J., James, R., & Croft, D. P. (2010). Personality in the context of social  
569 networks. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 365, 4099–4106.

- 570 Kuehl, H. S., Elzner, C., Moebius, Y., Boesch, C., & Walsh, P. D. (2008). The price of  
571 play: Self-organized infant mortality cycles in chimpanzees. *PLoS ONE*, 3, 1–10.
- 572 Kurvers, R. H. J. M., Adamczyk, V. M. a P., Kraus, R. H. S., Hoffman, J. I., van Wieren,  
573 S. E., van der Jeugd, H. P., ... Jonker, R. M. (2013). Contrasting context  
574 dependence of familiarity and kinship in animal social networks. *Animal Behaviour*,  
575 86, 993–1001.
- 576 Lefevre, C. E., Wilson, V. a D., Morton, F. B., Brosnan, S. F., Paukner, A., & Bates, T.  
577 C. (2014). Facial width-to-height ratio relates to alpha status and assertive  
578 personality in capuchin monkeys. *PLoS ONE*, 9, 1–8.
- 579 Leonardi, R., Buchanan-Smith, H. M., Dufour, V., MacDonald, C., & Whiten, A. (2010).  
580 Living together: Behavior and welfare in single and mixed species groups of  
581 capuchin (*Cebus apella*) and squirrel monkeys (*Saimiri sciureus*). *American Journal*  
582 *of Primatology*, 72, 33–47.
- 583 Loretto, M.-C., Fraser, O. N., & Bugnyar, T. (2012). Ontogeny of social relations and  
584 coalition formation in common ravens (*Corvus corax*). *International Journal of*  
585 *Comparative Psychology*, 25, 180–194.
- 586 Lusseau, D., & Newman, M. E. J. (2004). Identifying the role that animals play in their  
587 social networks. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 271, S477–S481.

- 588 Lusseau, D., Wilson, B., Hammond, P. S., Grellier, K., Durban, J. W., Parsons, K. M., ...  
 589 Thompson, P. M. (2006). Quantifying the influence of sociality on population  
 590 structure in bottlenose dolphins. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 75, 14–24.
- 591 MacCormick, H. a., MacNulty, D. R., Bosacker, A. L., Lehman, C., Bailey, A., Anthony  
 592 Collins, D., & Packer, C. (2012). Male and female aggression: Lessons from sex,  
 593 rank, age, and injury in olive baboons. *Behavioral Ecology*, 23, 684–691.
- 594 Macdonald, C., & Whiten, a. (2011). The “Living Links to Human Evolution” research  
 595 centre in Edinburgh zoo: A new endeavour in collaboration. *International Zoo*  
 596 *Yearbook*, 45, 7–17.
- 597 Majolo, B., Ventura, R., & Schino, G. (2010). Asymmetry and dimensions of relationship  
 598 quality in the japanese macaque (*Macaca fuscata yakui*). *International Journal of*  
 599 *Primatology*, 31, 736–750.
- 600 Manson, J. H., & Perry, S. (2013). Personality structure, sex differences, and temporal  
 601 change and stability in wild white-faced capuchins (*Cebus capucinus*). *Journal of*  
 602 *Comparative Psychology*, 127, 299–311.
- 603 Martin, P., Bateson, P. (2007). Measuring behaviour: an introductory guide. Cambridge,  
 604 UK: Cambridge University Press.
- 605 Martins, C. I. M., Silva, P. I. M., Conceição, L. E. C., Costas, B., Höglund, E., Øverli, Ø.,  
 606 & Schrama, J. W. (2011). Linking fearfulness and coping styles in fish. *PLoS ONE*,  
 607 6, e28084.

- 608 Massen, J. J. M., & Koski, S. E. (2014). Chimps of a feather sit together: Chimpanzee  
 609 friendships are based on homophily in personality. *Evolution and Human Behavior*,  
 610 35, 1–8.
- 611 McFarland, R., & Majolo, B. (2011). Exploring the components, asymmetry and  
 612 distribution of relationship quality in wild barbary macaques (*Macaca sylvanus*).  
 613 *PLoS ONE*, 6, e28826.
- 614 Millot, S., Cerqueira, M., Castanheira, M.-F., Øverli, Ø., Oliveira, R. F., & Martins, C. I.  
 615 M. (2014). Behavioural stress responses predict environmental perception in  
 616 European sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*). *PLoS ONE*, 9, e108800.
- 617 Morin, P. a, Moore, J. J., Chakraborty, R., Jin, L., Goodall, J., & Woodruff, D. S. (1994).  
 618 Kin selection, social structure, gene flow, and the evolution of chimpanzees.  
 619 *Science*, 265, 1193–1201.
- 620 Morton, F. B., Lee, P. C., & Buchanan-Smith, H. M. (2013). Taking personality selection  
 621 bias seriously in animal cognition research: A case study in capuchin monkeys  
 622 (*Sapajus apella*). *Animal Cognition*, 16, 677–684.
- 623 Morton, F. B., Lee, P. C., Buchanan-Smith, H. M., Brosnan, S. F., Thierry, B., Paukner,  
 624 A., ... Weiss, A. (2013). Personality structure in brown capuchin monkeys (*Sapajus*  
 625 *apella*): comparisons with chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*), orangutans (*Pongo*  
 626 *spp.*), and rhesus macaques (*Macaca mulatta*). *Journal of Comparative*  
 627 *Psychology*, 127, 282–98.

- 628 Morton, F. B. (2014). Individual differences in learning, personality, and social success  
 629 in brown capuchin monkeys (*Sapajus apella*). Doctoral thesis submitted to the  
 630 University of Stirling.
- 631 Parr, L., Matheson, M., Bernstein, I., & De waal FBM. (1997). Grooming down the  
 632 hierarchy: allogrooming in captive brown capuchin monkeys, *Cebus apella*. *Animal*  
 633 *Behaviour*, 54, 361–7.
- 634 Perry, S., Manson, J. H., Muniz, L., Gros-Louis, J., & Vigilant, L. (2008). Kin-biased  
 635 social behaviour in wild adult female white-faced capuchins, *Cebus capucinus*.  
 636 *Animal Behaviour*, 76, 187–199.
- 637 Pilot, M., Dahlheim, M. E., & Hoelzel, a. R. (2010). Social cohesion among kin, gene  
 638 flow without dispersal and the evolution of population genetic structure in the killer  
 639 whale (*Orcinus orca*). *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 23, 20–31.
- 640 R Core Team. (2014). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. *R*  
 641 *Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria*, URL [http://www.R–](http://www.R-project.org/)  
 642 [project.org/](http://www.R-project.org/).
- 643 Raoult, V., Brown, C., Zuberi, A., & Williamson, J. E. (2012). Blood cortisol  
 644 concentrations predict boldness in juvenile mulloway (*Argyrosomus japonicus*).  
 645 *Journal of Ethology*, 30, 225–232.
- 646 Rebecchini, L., Schaffner, C. M., & Aureli, F. (2011). Risk is a component of social  
 647 relationships in spider monkeys. *Ethology*, 117, 691–699.



- 648 Sapolsky, R. M. (2004). Social status and health in humans and other animals. *Annual*  
649 *Review of Anthropology*, 33, 393–418.
- 650 Schino, G., Di Giuseppe, F., & Visalberghi, E. (2009). Grooming, rank, and agonistic  
651 support in tufted capuchin monkeys. *American Journal of Primatology*, 71, 101–  
652 105.
- 653 Schuett, W., Dall, S. R. X., & Royle, N. J. (2011). Pairs of zebra finches with similar  
654 “personalities” make better parents. *Animal Behaviour*, 81, 609–618.
- 655 Schülke, O., Bhagavatula, J., Vigilant, L., & Ostner, J. (2010). Social bonds enhance  
656 reproductive success in male macaques. *Current Biology*, 20, 2207–2210.
- 657 Selfhout, M., Denissen, J., Branje, S., & Meeus, W. (2009). In the eye of the beholder:  
658 perceived, actual, and peer-rated similarity in personality, communication, and  
659 friendship intensity during the acquaintanceship process. *Journal of Personality and*  
660 *Social Psychology*, 96, 1152–1165.
- 661 Seyfarth, R. M., Silk, J. B., & Cheney, D. L. (2012). Variation in personality and fitness  
662 in wild female baboons. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109,  
663 16980–16985.
- 664 Seyfarth, R. M., Silk, J. B., & Cheney, D. L. (2014). Social bonds in female baboons: the  
665 interaction between personality, kinship and rank. *Animal Behaviour*, 87, 23–29.

- 666 Sih, a., & Del Giudice, M. (2012). Linking behavioural syndromes and cognition: a  
 667 behavioural ecology perspective. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*  
 668 *B: Biological Sciences*, 367, 2762–2772.
- 669 Silk, J. B., Beehner, J. C., Bergman, T. J., Crockford, C., Engh, A. L., Moscovice, L. R.,  
 670 ... Cheney, D. L. (2010). Strong and consistent social bonds enhance the longevity  
 671 of female baboons. *Current Biology*, 20, 1359–1361.
- 672 Sinn, D. L., Apiolaza, L. a., & Moltschaniwskyj, N. a. (2006). Heritability and fitness-  
 673 related consequences of squid personality traits. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*,  
 674 19, 1437–1447.
- 675 Steiper, M. E., & Young, N. M. (2006). Primate molecular divergence dates. *Molecular*  
 676 *Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 41, 384–394.
- 677 Tiddi, B., Aureli, F., Polizzi Di Sorrentino, E., Janson, C. H., & Schino, G. (2011).  
 678 Grooming for tolerance? Two mechanisms of exchange in wild tufted capuchin  
 679 monkeys. *Behavioral Ecology*, 22, 663–669.
- 680 Tiddi, B., Aureli, F., & Schino, G. (2012). Grooming up the hierarchy: The exchange of  
 681 grooming and rank-related benefits in a new world primate. *PLoS ONE*, 7, 3–8.
- 682 Trivers, R. L. (1972). Parental Investment and Sexual Selection. In: B. Campbell (Ed.)  
 683 *Sexual Selection and the Descent of Man, 1871-1971* (pp. 136–179).
- 684 Uher, J., Addessi, E., & Visalberghi, E. (2013). Contextualised behavioural  
 685 measurements of personality differences obtained in behavioural tests and social

- 686 observations in adult capuchin monkeys (*Cebus apella*). *Journal of Research in*  
 687 *Personality*, 47, 427–444.
- 688 Van Aelst, S., & Willems, G. (2009). Fast and robust bootstrap for multivariate  
 689 inference: The R package FRB. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 53.
- 690 Van Oers, K., Drent, P. J., de Goede, P., & van Noordwijk, A. J. (2004). Realized  
 691 heritability and repeatability of risk-taking behaviour in relation to avian  
 692 personalities. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 271, 65–73.
- 693 Weinstein, T., & Capitanio, J. (2008). Individual differences in infant temperament  
 694 predict social relationships of yearling rhesus monkeys, *Macaca mulatta*. *Animal*  
 695 *Behaviour*, 76, 455–465.
- 696 Weiss, A., & Adams, M. J. (2010). Personality, Temperament, and Behavioral  
 697 Syndromes. In *Encyclopedia of Behavioral Neuroscience* (pp. 47–53).
- 698 Weiss, A., Gartner, M. C., Gold, K. C., & Stoinski, T. S. (2013). Extraversion predicts  
 699 longer survival in gorillas: An 18-year longitudinal study. *Proceedings of the Royal*  
 700 *Society B*, 280, 20122231.
- 701 Weiss, A., Inoue-Murayama, M., Hong, K. W., Inoue, E., Uono, T., Ochiai, T., ... King,  
 702 J. E. (2009). Assessing chimpanzee personality and subjective well-being in japan.  
 703 *American Journal of Primatology*, 71, 283–292.

- 704 Weiss, A., King, J. E., & Perkins, L. (2006). Personality and subjective well-being in  
 705 orangutans (*Pongo pygmaeus* and *Pongo abelii*). *Journal of Personality and Social*  
 706 *Psychology*, 90, 501–511.
- 707 Welker, C., Höhmann, H., & Schäfer-Witt, C. (1990). Significance of kin relations and  
 708 individual preferences in the social behaviour of *Cebus apella*. *Folia Primatologica;*  
 709 *International Journal of Primatology*, 54, 166–170.
- 710 Widdig, a, Nürnberg, P., Krawczak, M., Streich, W. J., & Bercovitch, F. B. (2001).  
 711 Paternal relatedness and age proximity regulate social relationships among adult  
 712 female rhesus macaques. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 98,  
 713 13769–13773.
- 714 Wolf, M., van Doorn, G. S., Leimar, O., & Weissing, F. J. (2007). Life-history trade-offs  
 715 favour the evolution of animal personalities. *Nature*, 447, 581–584.
- 716 Zelner, J. L., Trostle, J., Goldstick, J. E., Cevallos, W., House, J. S., & Eisenberg, J. N.  
 717 S. (2012). Social connectedness and disease transmission: Social organization,  
 718 cohesion, village context, and infection risk in rural Ecuador. *American Journal of*  
 719 *Public Health*, 102, 2233–2239.
- 720 Zimmerberg, B., & Farley, M. J. (1993). Sex differences in anxiety behavior in rats: role  
 721 of gonadal hormones. *Physiology & Behavior*, 54, 1119–1124.
- 722 Zwick, W. R., & Velicer, W. F. (1986). Comparison of five rules for determining the  
 723 number of components to retain. *Psychological Bulletin*, 99, 432–442.
- 724

725 Table 1. Highest item loadings and examples of positive correlations with behavioural codings for capuchin personality  
 726 dimensions.

|  | Personality Dimensions                     |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
|  | Assertiveness                              | Openness   | Neuroticism  | Sociability  | Attentiveness   |
| Highest Loadings                                 | + Aggressive<br>+ Bullying<br>– Submissive | + Inventive<br>+ Innovative<br>+ Inquisitive             | – Cool<br>– Stable<br>+ Excitable                          | + Sociability<br>+ Affectionate<br>– Solitary        | – Disorganized<br>– Unperceptive<br>– Thoughtless           |
| Examples of Positive Correlations with Behaviour | Rates of aggression <sup>b</sup>           | Task participation and learning performance <sup>a</sup> | Social avoidance and lack of focus on tasks <sup>b,c</sup> | Time spent in close proximity to others <sup>b</sup> | Longer attention span during cognitive testing <sup>b</sup> |

727 Note: + and – refer to the direction of trait loadings. For example, “+ Excitable” means that subjects high in Neuroticism  
 728 are excitable and “- Solitary” indicates that subjects high on Sociability are not solitary. <sup>a</sup>Morton, Lee, Buchanan-Smith, et  
 729 al., 2013, <sup>b</sup>Morton, Lee, Buchanan-Smith, et al., 2013, <sup>c</sup>Morton (2014).

730 Table 2. Behaviours recorded during focal sampling.

| Behaviour            | Definition  |
|----------------------|---|
| Aggression           | Open-mouth threats, vocal threats, lunging, chasing, hitting, and/or biting.  |
| Coalitionary support | Another individual intervenes during a conflict between two parties, directing aggression towards only one of the combatants. |
| Feeding              | Searching for, or ingesting food.   |
| Food sharing         | One individual allows another individual to take pieces of its food (from hands or mouth).                                    |
| Grooming             | Picking through the hair of another individual.   |
| Scrounging           | Exploiting food found by others; successful begging or stealing food from others.   |
| Solitary             | No monkey within two body lengths away from the focal.  |

731

732

733

734

735

736

737

738

739

740 Table 3. Definitions and calculations of social behaviours entered into principal components analysis.

| Social Behaviour      | Definition  | Calculation   |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| Avoid/Stay Symmetry   | Symmetry in number of times a monkey avoided/stayed at monopolizeable food source as they were approached by other member of the dyad.              | $(\text{no. times A approaches B}) / [(\text{no. times A approaches B}) + (\text{no. times B approaches A})]$ |
| Coalitions            | Number of aggressive events in which one member of the dyad supports the other.   | $[(\text{no. times A supports B}) + (\text{no. times B supports A})]$   |
| Aggression            | Number of aggressive events within dyad.  | $[(\text{no. times A aggresses B}) + (\text{no. times B aggresses A})]$                                       |
| Aggression Symmetry   | Symmetry in conflict within dyad.   | $(\text{no. times A aggresses B}) / [(\text{no. times A aggresses B}) + (\text{no. times B aggresses A})]$    |
| Food Sharing          | Number of food sharing events within dyad.  | $[(\text{no. times A gives to B}) + (\text{no. times B gives to A})]$   |
| Food Sharing Symmetry | Symmetry in food sharing within dyad.   | $(\text{no. times A gives to B}) / [(\text{no. times A gives to B}) + (\text{no. times B gives to A})]$       |
| Grooming              | Number of focal minutes spent grooming each other.  | $[(\text{no. minutes A grooms B}) + (\text{no. minutes B grooms A})]$   |
| Grooming Symmetry     | Symmetry in grooming within dyad.   | $(\text{no. minutes A grooms B}) / [(\text{no. minutes A grooms B}) + (\text{no. minutes B grooms A})]$       |
| Social Foraging       | Number of focal minutes spent in close proximity ( $\leq 2$ body lengths) from each other while at least one member of dyad is engaged in foraging. | $[(\% \text{ of time A within proximity of B}) + (\% \text{ of time B within proximity of A})]$               |
| Spatial Proximity     | Number of focal minutes spent in close proximity ( $\leq 2$ body lengths) to each other.  | $[(\% \text{ of time A within proximity of B}) + (\% \text{ of time B within proximity of A})]$               |

741 Note. Proximity calculations do not include time spent grooming or time spent social foraging (both of which were  
742 analysed as separate variables).



743 Table 4. Varimax-rotated structure of PCA for behavioural measures calculated per monkey dyad.

| Behaviour Index       | Varimax Rotation |              |                |
|-----------------------|------------------|--------------|----------------|
|                       | PC1              | PC2          | h <sup>2</sup> |
| Social Foraging       | <b>0.846</b>     | -0.026       | 0.321          |
| Spatial Proximity     | <b>0.803</b>     | -0.112       | 0.293          |
| Grooming              | <b>0.772</b>     | -0.077       | 0.438          |
| Coalitions            | <b>0.771</b>     | -0.033       | 0.658          |
| Food Sharing          | <b>0.651</b>     | -0.120       | 0.602          |
| Food Sharing Symmetry | <b>0.532</b>     | 0.272        | 0.716          |
| Conflict              | -0.053           | <b>0.875</b> | 0.357          |
| Conflict Symmetry     | 0.049            | <b>0.865</b> | 0.751          |

744 Note. Salient loadings (>|0.4|) for each behaviour in boldface; PC=principal component.

745

746

747

748

749

Table 5. Spearman correlations ( $\rho$ ) between similarities in age, kinship, rank, and personality traits and affiliative/agonistic scores and overall relationship quality (i.e. difference between affiliative and agonistic scores).

|               | Affiliative  |                         | Agonistic   |                       | Quality      |                         |
|---------------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
|               | $\rho$       | 95% CI                  | $\rho$      | 95% CI                | $\rho$       | 95% CI                  |
| Age           | 0.17         | [-0.05 to 0.38]         | <b>0.45</b> | <b>[0.22 to 0.61]</b> | <b>-0.26</b> | <b>[-0.46 to -0.01]</b> |
| Kinship       | 0.04         | [-0.22 to 0.27]         | -0.19       | [-0.40 to 0.03]       | 0.15         | [-0.09 to 0.37]         |
| Rank          | -0.11        | [-0.32 to 0.10]         | <b>0.33</b> | <b>[0.09 to 0.54]</b> | <b>-0.37</b> | <b>[-0.57 to -0.14]</b> |
| Assertiveness | 0.00         | [-0.26 to 0.25]         | 0.16        | [-0.08 to 0.37]       | -0.12        | [-0.33 to 0.11]         |
| Openness      | -0.10        | [-0.32 to 0.15]         | <b>0.29</b> | <b>[0.07 to 0.50]</b> | <b>-0.42</b> | <b>[-0.61 to -0.20]</b> |
| Neuroticism   | -0.18        | [-0.40 to 0.07]         | 0.09        | [-0.15 to 0.32]       | -0.12        | [-0.36 to 0.13]         |
| Sociability   | <b>-0.39</b> | <b>[-0.58 to -0.14]</b> | 0.10        | [-0.14 to 0.33]       | <b>-0.33</b> | <b>[-0.52 to -0.11]</b> |
| Attentiveness | 0.05         | [-0.22 to 0.29]         | 0.12        | [-0.10 to 0.33]       | -0.14        | [-0.37 to 0.09]         |

Note. 95% CI = bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals.  $df = 63$ . "Quality" = difference between affiliative and agonistic component scores per dyad. Spearman correlations with confidence limits that did not include 0 are presented in boldface. Confidence intervals and  $P$ -values generated by fast and robust bootstraps with 5000 samples in all analyses.

Table 6. Independent effects of non-dispositional factors and personality variables on affiliative scores, agonistic scores, and overall relationship quality (i.e. difference between affiliative and agonistic scores).

| Effect        | Affiliative  |             |                         |              | Agonistic |      |                 |          | Quality      |             |                         |              |
|---------------|--------------|-------------|-------------------------|--------------|-----------|------|-----------------|----------|--------------|-------------|-------------------------|--------------|
|               | b            | SE          | 95% CI                  | <i>P</i>     | b         | SE   | 95% CI          | <i>P</i> | b            | SE          | 95% CI                  | <i>P</i>     |
| Intercept     | -0.39        | 0.13        | [-0.63 to -0.14]        | 0.005        | -0.43     | 0.32 | [-1.07 to 0.17] | 0.18     | -0.03        | 0.22        | [-0.45 to 0.40]         | 0.89         |
| Sex           | 0.14         | 0.11        | [-0.08 to 0.34]         | 0.21         | 0.08      | 0.22 | [-0.32 to 0.55] | 0.69     | 0.09         | 0.17        | [-0.26 to 0.40]         | 0.64         |
| Age           | 0.01         | 0.01        | [0.00 to 0.03]          | 0.12         | 0.01      | 0.01 | [-0.01 to 0.03] | 0.55     | 0            | 0.01        | [-0.02 to 0.02]         | 0.95         |
| Rank          | -0.01        | 0.05        | [-0.11 to 0.10]         | 0.9          | 0.12      | 0.09 | [-0.06 to 0.28] | 0.16     | -0.18        | 0.1         | [-0.37 to 0.02]         | 0.07         |
| Kinship       | -0.09        | 0.37        | [-0.80 to 0.62]         | 0.82         | -0.23     | 0.39 | [-0.94 to 0.61] | 0.55     | -0.19        | 0.49        | [-1.20 to 0.73]         | 0.67         |
| Assertiveness | -0.11        | 0.07        | [-0.24 to 0.02]         | 0.086        | 0.01      | 0.07 | [-0.14 to 0.14] | 0.84     | -0.06        | 0.07        | [-0.21 to 0.08]         | 0.35         |
| Openness      | -0.04        | 0.08        | [-0.20 to 0.12]         | 0.68         | 0.01      | 0.06 | [-0.11 to 0.13] | 0.86     | -0.15        | 0.1         | [-0.35 to 0.06]         | 0.15         |
| Neuroticism   | <b>-0.19</b> | <b>0.07</b> | <b>[-0.35 to -0.08]</b> | <b>0.002</b> | 0.09      | 0.23 | [-0.38 to 0.50] | 0.71     | -0.04        | 0.08        | [-0.21 to 0.12]         | 0.57         |
| Sociability   | -0.12        | 0.06        | [-0.24 to 0.01]         | 0.066        | -0.01     | 0.06 | [-0.13 to 0.10] | 0.8      | <b>-0.17</b> | <b>0.07</b> | <b>[-0.31 to -0.05]</b> | <b>0.007</b> |
| Attentiveness | 0.14         | 0.08        | [-0.03 to 0.27]         | 0.1          | -0.01     | 0.07 | [-0.15 to 0.12] | 0.83     | -0.02        | 0.08        | [-0.21 to 0.12]         | 0.65         |

Note. Significant results ( $P < 0.05$ ) in boldface. *df* in all cases = 63. Standard errors (SE), 95% confidence intervals (95% CI), and *P*-values generated by fast and robust bootstraps with 5000 samples in all three analyses.

761 Table A1. Results of Horn's (1965) Parallel Analysis for Component Retention.

| Component | Adjusted<br>Eigenvalues |
|-----------|-------------------------|
| 1         | <b>2.920683</b>         |
| 2         | <b>1.202033</b>         |
| 3         | 0.858408                |
| 4         | 0.708558                |
| 5         | 0.549795                |
| 6         | 0.568731                |
| 7         | 0.533918                |
| 8         | 0.527448                |
| 9         | 0.549315                |
| 10        | 0.568179                |

762 Note. 1,000 iterations, using the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile estimate; adjusted eigenvalues >1.0  
 763 indicate dimensions to retain; 2 components retained (boldface). Unadjusted  
 764 eigenvalues are those used for the scree test (Fig 2A).

765 Table A2. Mean  $\pm$  SE social behaviour per monkey dyad.

| <b>Social Behaviour</b> | <b>Mean <math>\pm</math> SE per dyad</b> |
|-------------------------|--|
| Avoid/Stay Symmetry     | -7.32 $\pm$ 1.3*                         |
| Coalitions              | 0.21 $\pm$ 0.07                          |
| Conflict                | 1.01 $\pm$ 0.18                          |
| Conflict Symmetry       | 0.49 $\pm$ 0.19                          |
| Food Sharing            | 0.44 $\pm$ 0.11                          |
| Food Sharing Symmetry   | 0.001 $\pm$ 0.1                          |
| Grooming                | 1.82 $\pm$ 0.41                          |
| Grooming Symmetry       | 0.03 $\pm$ 0.35                          |
| Spatial Proximity       | 12.16 $\pm$ 1.63                         |
| Social Foraging         | 4.74 $\pm$ 0.64                          |

766 Note.  $N = 73$ . Negative values indicate that one monkey within the dyad stayed more  
 767 than retreated when approached by the other monkey.

768

769

770

771

772

773

774

775

776

777

778

779

780

Table A3. Promax-rotated structure of PCA for behavioural measures calculated per monkey dyad.

| Behaviour Index       | Promax Rotation |              |                |
|-----------------------|-----------------|--------------|----------------|
|                       | PC1             | PC2          | h <sup>2</sup> |
| Social Foraging       | <b>0.847</b>    | 0.010        | 0.321          |
| Spatial Proximity     | <b>0.802</b>    | -0.078       | 0.293          |
| Grooming              | <b>0.771</b>    | -0.044       | 0.438          |
| Coalitions            | <b>0.771</b>    | 0.000        | 0.658          |
| Food Sharing          | <b>0.649</b>    | -0.092       | 0.602          |
| Food Sharing Symmetry | <b>0.541</b>    | 0.295        | 0.716          |
| Conflict              | -0.027          | <b>0.875</b> | 0.357          |
| Conflict Symmetry     | 0.075           | <b>0.869</b> | 0.751          |

Note. Salient loadings ( $>|0.4|$ ) for each behaviour in boldface; PC=principal component.

796 Figure A1. Diagram illustrating the design of each puzzle feeder introduced to the  
797 outdoor enclosure of East and West groups.

798


799 Figure A2. Scree test for component retention. Black circles indicate components that  
800 were retained; clear circles indicate components that were discarded.

## **Acknowledgements**

Special thanks go to Prof. Andrew Whiten, Director of Living Links, for permission to conduct research at LL, and to the LL students and staff for support and assistance during data collection. Thanks also go to our collaborators and the many raters involved in the original capuchin personality study, and to Sarah Vick, Nicola Koyama, and the two anonymous reviewers for providing useful comments on earlier versions of the manuscript. F.B.M. thanks the University of Stirling and the Primate Society of Great Britain for funding. The authors declare they have no conflict of interest.



Figure



Figure

